

Chicago-Kent Law Review

Volume 5 | Issue 3

Article 2

December 1926

Editorials

Chicago-Kent Law Review

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.kentlaw.iit.edu/cklawreview>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Chicago-Kent Law Review, *Editorials*, 5 Chi.-Kent L. Rev. 3 (1926).

Available at: <https://scholarship.kentlaw.iit.edu/cklawreview/vol5/iss3/2>

This Notes is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarly Commons @ IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Chicago-Kent Law Review by an authorized editor of Scholarly Commons @ IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law. For more information, please contact jwenger@kentlaw.iit.edu, ebarney@kentlaw.iit.edu.

THE CHICAGO-KENT REVIEW

Published Monthly during the School Year
by the Students of The Chicago-Kent College
of Law, 10 North Franklin Street, Chicago.

Matriculated students are subscribers by
virtue of the incidental fee charged them.
Subscription price to others \$1.00 per year.

It is the purpose of the Review to act as a
medium of news and for the exchange of ideas
of Chicago-Kent alumni and students. Con-
tributions of news or legal articles will be
gratefully received.

Irving S. Toplon, '28	- - -	Editor
Wendell H. Shanner, '25	-	Faculty Editor
Edwin H. Felt, '27	-	Athletic Editor
G. M. Schatz, '27	-	Organization Editor
Ernest E. Tapes, '18	-	Alumni Editor
Harold Fishbein, '27	-	Book Review Editor
Grace Cooper, '27	-	Women's Editor
Kate Zoot, '27	-	Associate Women's Editor
R. P. Lowther, '27	-	Advertising Manager

Volume 5. December, 1926. Number 3.

EDITORIALS

Freshman Spirit

It seems fitting to com-
ment upon and com-
mend the Freshman for
a display of Class Spirit such as has not
been evidenced at Kent for some time.
On the occasion of the debate between
the Senior and Freshman teams for the
college championship, a goodly number
of the First-Year men and women
turned out en masse and actually
"rooted" for their representatives. This
evidence of class interest might well be
emulated by the upper classmen and by
the students of the College in general in
cases of inter-collegiate as well as inter-
class competition, and will go far toward
promoting and fostering a fine loyalty to
the College.

Common Courtesy

Although it may be all
very well to harbour a
feeling of undue restraint
and to chafe somewhat under the bonds
of impatience when an instructor holds
the class over-time, yet it seems to us
that the dictates of the most elementary
courtesy would prohibit thoughtless stu-
dents from violently slamming books,

scuffling their feet, and scraping chairs
meaningly when the buzzer announces
the close of a class' period. The respect
due the Professor should prompt the
members of a class to permit him at
least to conclude the sentence which he
has commenced, if not to drive home the
point he is trying to make. We should
bear in mind, moreover, that the dem-
onstration of that point of law is pecu-
liarly to OUR benefit, not the instruct-
or's.

NOTES ON PRACTICE COURT.

On Wednesday night, November 17,
the first directed verdict given this year,
was rendered against Chapman and
Haskell, in favor of Murray and Jacoby,
the defendants. Three of the plaintiff's
witnesses had been examined when the
court became conscious of the fact that
the attorneys for the plaintiff were not
presenting their case according to the
state of facts given the parties. The
Judge explained vociferously that the
attorneys for the plaintiff were the first
two men in ten years to misinterpret the
state of facts in the case, as indicated by
the conduct of the case, whereupon Mr.
Haskell, associate counsel, in his usual
suave and characteristic manner, sup-
ported ably by Mr. Chapman, attempted
to explain to His Honor, that this was
the "modern interpretation" of the case.
Upon motion of the defendant at this
time, the Court instructed the jury to
bring in a verdict for the defendants.

The results in this instance should
serve as a lesson to those prosecuting
cases in the future in the "Honorable
Practice Court." The cases as drawn
up are meant to provide at least a pass-
able case for both sides, and it is up to
their personal ingenuity to make a weak
side a strong one, but no license is
given attorneys to vary the facts or mis-
lead the jury by the addition of a mul-
titude of immaterial testimony on a side
issue.